

another or resort to any subterfuge to keep the application pending.¹ Thus it is respectfully submitted that the final status of the Office Action is premature and should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner does not withdraw the final status of the Office Action, Applicants submit that this response does not raise new issues in the application. It is submitted that the present response places the application in condition for allowance or, at least, presents the application in better form for appeal. Entry of the present response is therefore respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated December 31, 2003 and has made amendments to the claims. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1-29 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- (2-3) Rejected claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642); and
- (4-5) Rejected claims 5, 14, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642) in view of Parthasarathy et al (U.S. 6,347,398).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection and rejections have been overcome based on the aforementioned amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

¹ See MPEP § 706.07.

The Applicants have submitted two affidavits under 37 CFR 1.131 herewith to remove the Bourke-Dunphy reference. The effective filing date for the subject patent application of January 21, 2000 is not more than one year from the publication date of November 22, 2001 of the Bourke-Dunphy reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642), and rejections of claims 5, 14, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642) in view of Parthasarathy et al (U.S. 6,347,398) should be withdrawn.

Overview of the Present Invention

The present invention solves the problem with prior art logon scripts for setting up client workstation environments by copying files, creating connections, and launching applications. Prior art logon scripts such as those available on Novell Corporation's Netware products have been around for years. The present invention overcomes the problems with creating, managing and debugging logon scripts through the use of an intuitive GUI (graphical user interface), which allows each client workstation on a network to be centrally managed.

The present invention eliminates the need to debug and manage code for each client workstation by supplying a configuration during the logon process, which was previously created using the centralized administrator's GUI tool. This configuration handles more advance function not possible with simple batch files such as network administration including group membership, printer deployment, proxy server access, MS Office paths, service packs, anti-virus update, policies and automat Outlook/Exchange mail profile creations. Moreover, the present invention, permits validation of settings for a given user on a given client workstation, before a resource is given to a group, such as providing access to the accounting data share only if a user is a member of the accounting group.

Unlike other systems where a customized scripting file is made for each user on each machine, a single set of configuration files is made. The identical set of configuration

files is shared across all clients in the network attached to the server. The set of configuration files contains one or more defined configuration settings, wherein the configuration files were previously built through use of a graphical interface, and without the need to create client specific text edit logon scripts. Stated differently, once the set of configuration files is configured at the server along with the attendant application, both the configuration file and the application are static across all client systems. The use of static configuration files and applications provides the present invention with the advantage of allowing any authenticated user to use any computer in the network. The configuration settings in the set of configuration files as used by an application program during boot-up. The application file validates at least one of the configuration settings in the configuration based on logon authentication and validates one or more run-time environmental variables of the client system; the variables consisting of an IP subnet address, a LAN group membership, and a registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system. Therefore the present invention has the advantage over other systems of allowing the same configuration file and the same application file to be used across all clients. Only the execution of the application with the configuration file changes at runtime depending on a combination of user logon authentication and one or more run-time environmental variables.

In order to more particularly point out this feature of a graphical scripting tool with for creating a set of one or more configuration files which identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server and in response to the user logging on and authenticated to the server, executing an application program that takes the set of one or more configuration files and applies at least one of the defined configuration settings to the client system so as to automatically configure for the user on the client system, one or more configuration settings, wherein the application program executes so as to validate at least one of the configuration settings in the configuration based on logon authentication and validates one or more run-time environmental variables of the client system, the variables consisting of at least one of (i) an IP subnet address, (ii) a LAN group membership, and (iii) a registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system, the following language has been added to the independent claims, i.e., claims 1, 15, 24 and 27 as follows:

- Claims 1, 24 and 27

receiving a set of one or more configuration files from a server, over a previously configured network interface, the set of configuration files are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server, and wherein the set configuration files containing one or more defined configuration settings, wherein the configuration files were previously built through use of a graphical interface, and without the need to create client specific text edit logon scripts;

in response to the user logging on and authenticated to the server, executing an application program that takes the set of one or more configuration files and applies at least one of the defined configuration settings to the client system so as to automatically configure for a user on the client system, zero or more configuration settings, wherein the application program executes so as to validate at least one of the configuration settings in the configuration based on logon authentication and validates one or more of run-time environmental variables of the client system, the variables consisting of at least one of (i) an IP subnet address, (ii) a LAN group membership, and (iii) at least one registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system, and wherein the application executes after the client system boots-up, loads an operating system and before an operating system shell is presented to the user.

- Claim 15

presenting a graphical user interface to a user containing user selectable items representing one or more configuration settings for at least one user on at least one client system and wherein the settings are customized without the need to create client specific text edit logon scripts;

receiving one or more user selections on the graphical user interface;

storing the one or more user selections in a set of one or more configuration files so as to automatically configure for at least one user on the client system, at least one configuration setting, wherein the set of configuration files are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to a server; and

transferring the set of one or more configuration files from the server over

a previously configured network interface to the client system so as to cause an application program to take the set of one or more configuration files and apply at least one of the defined configuration settings to the client system so as to automatically configure for the user on the client system, at least one configuration setting, wherein the application program is loaded and validates at least one of the configuration settings based on logon authentication and validates one or more run-time environmental variables of the client system, the variables consisting of an IP subnet address, a LAN group membership, and a registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system, and wherein the application executes after the client system boots-up, loads an operating system and before an operating system shell is presented to the user.

(2-3) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642). Further, as noted above, the Applicant has submitted two affidavits under 37 CFR 1.131 herewith to remove the Bourke-Dunphy reference. Although the present invention predates the Bourke-Dunphy reference, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, 24 and 27 for clarity to distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy.

As an initial matter, Bourke-Dunphy teaches a system for integrating client computers into a computer network. The problem solved by Bourke-Dunphy is to configure a network interface whereas the present invention relies on a previously configured network interface. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, 24, and 27 distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy for at least this reason.

Continuing further, the logon script as created by Bourke-Dunphy is customized to each client. See FIG. 15B and col. 7, lines 1-10. In the words of Bourke-Dunphy at col. 7, lines 1-10 (emphasis added): *"As shown in FIG. 15b, SCW receives the template file, obtains the user-specific data from the user account files and user input, extracts user-specific data from the server operating system registry, and produces the logon script."*

After completion of step 97, the SCW terminates.” The present invention distinguishes over Bourke-Dunphy by using a set of configuration files are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server. Stated differently, once the set of configuration files is configured at the server along with the attendant application, both the configuration file and the application are static across all client systems. The use of static configuration files and applications provides the present invention with the advantage of allowing any authenticated user to use any computer in the network. The configuration settings in the set of configuration files as used by an application program during boot-up. Bourke-Dunphy is completely silent on using the identical set of configuration files across all clients in the network. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, 24, and 27 distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy for at least this reason.

The Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and a proper rejection requires that a single reference teach (i.e., identically describe) each and every element of the rejected claims as being anticipated by Bourke-Dunphy.¹ The elements in independent claims 1, 15, 23, and 27 of “receiving a set of one or more configuration files from a server, over a previously configured network interface, the set of configuration files are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server, and wherein the set configuration files” and “wherein the application program executes so as to validate at least one of the configuration settings in the configuration based on logon authentication and validates one or more of run-time environmental variables of the client system, the variables consisting of at least one of (i) an IP subnet address, (ii) a LAN group membership, and (iii) at least one registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system” is not taught or disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

¹ See MPEP '2131 (Emphasis Added) A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.”

Independent claims 1, 15, 24, and 27 have been amended to distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy. Claims 3-4, 6-13, 16-18, 20-22, and 25-29 depend from claims 1, 15, 24, and 27 respectively, since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 3-4, 6-13, 16-18, 20-22, and 25-29 distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy, as well.

(4-5) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Bourke-Dunphy and Parthasarathy

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 14, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642) in view of Parthasarathy et al (U.S. 6,347,398).² Further, as noted above, the Applicant has submitted an affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131 herewith to remove the Bourke-Dunphy reference. Although the present invention predates the Bourke-Dunphy reference, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 15 for clarity to distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy.

As stated in the section entitled “(2-3) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)”, Bourke-Dunphy is completely silent on “receiving a set of one or more configuration files from a server, over a previously configured network interface, the set of configuration files are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server, and wherein the set configuration files” and “wherein the application program executes so as to validate at least one of the configuration settings in the configuration based on logon authentication and validates one or more of run-time environmental variables of the client system, the variables consisting of at least one of (i) an IP subnet address, (ii) a LAN group membership, and (iii) at least one registry entry, before applying the configurations settings to the client system.” Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15 distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy for at least this reason.

² Applicant makes not statement whether such combination is even proper.

Further, Applicants submit that the combination of Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy with *teaches away* from the set of configuration files “are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server, and wherein the set configuration files.” Bourke-Dunphy explicitly teaches that each template file has “user-specific data”. See FIG. 15b and col. 7, lines 1-10. The Federal Circuit has held that such references teach away from the combination and thus cannot serve as predicates for a *prima facie* case of obviousness.³ Accordingly, the independent claims 1 and 15 of the present invention is distinguishable over Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy for this reason as well.

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has consistently held that when a §103 rejection is based upon a modification of a reference that destroys the intent, purpose or function of the invention disclosed in the reference, such a proposed modification is not proper and the *prima facie* case of obviousness can not be properly made. See *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Here the intent, purpose and function of Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy is create at the server client-specific templates with *user specific data*. In contrast the intent and purpose of the present invention is “set of configuration files “are identical to configuration files received by other client systems attached to the server, and wherein the set configuration files””. Unlike the prior references, the present invention provides the advantage of allowing any authenticated user to use any computer in the network because only one set of configuration files and the attendant application is used. This combination, as suggested by the Examiner, destroys the intent and purpose of “Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy teaching of client-specific templates. Accordingly, the independent claims 1 and 15 of present invention is distinguishable over Bourke-Dunphy taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy for this reason as well.

³ See *In re Sponnoble*, 405 F.2d 578, 587, 160 USPQ 237, 244 (CCPA 1969) (references teach away from combination if combination produces seemingly inoperative device); see also *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (inoperable modification teaches away).

Independent claims 1, and 15 have been amended to distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642) taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy. Claims 5, 14, 19, and 23 depend from claims 1, and 15 respectively. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 5, 14, 19, and 23 distinguish over Bourke-Dunphy et al., (US 6,449,642) taken alone and/or in view of Parthasarathy, as well.

CONCLUSION

The remaining cited references have been reviewed and are not believed to affect the patentability of the claims as amended.

In this Response, the Applicant has amended certain claims. In light of the Office Action, Applicant believes these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

Applicant acknowledges the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclosure of information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment is limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicant and his attorney.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the grounds for rejection stated in the Examiner's Office Action have been overcome, and that all claims in the application are allowable. No new matter has been added. It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

PLEASE CALL the undersigned if that would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2004

By: 

Jon Gibbons, Reg. No. 37, 333
Attorney for Applicant
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN, BONGINI, & BIANCO P.L.
551 N.W. 77th Street, Suite 111
Boca Raton, FL 33487
Tel (561) 989-9811
Fax (561) 989-9812

Please Direct All Future Correspondence to Customer Number **23334**